

ACK
NEX

5

074

638

#5

Isaiah's Parable of the Vineyard

A
0
0
0
0
1
2
6
3
6
3
3
1

DC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

By PAUL HAUPT
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Reprinted from
**THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC
LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES**

(Continuing "HEBRAICA")

VOLUME XIX, No. 4

JULY, 1903

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
(CONTINUING "HEBRAICA")

VOLUME XIX

JULY, 1903

NUMBER 4

ISAIAH'S PARABLE OF THE VINEYARD.

BY PAUL HAUPT,
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Cheyne says in his notes on Is. 5, in *The Polychrome Bible*, that 'the Parable of the Vineyard takes the form of a song. The prophet assumes the character of a popular singer. If he accompanied his song with music, he must have changed his note at v. 3, and what an effect must have been produced when in the middle of a sentence (v. 6) he suddenly passed out of the lyric into the grave prophetic rhythm, and became no longer a singer but an orator.' These remarks are evidently based on Duhm's commentary.* Duhm's analysis of the poem has been adopted also by Marti.† Duhm thinks that there is a different rhythm from וְעַלֵּה שְׁמִיר וְשִׁיר on; but this clause is a gloss, and the following lines exhibit the same rhythm as the preceding stanzas. In his *Introduction*‡ Cheyne says that vv. 1-7 are in two distinct rhythms or meters; the division is at v. 6^c, when Isaiah, in the midst of his threatening prophecy respecting the vineyard, suddenly exchanges the light, dancing, popular rhythm for a heavy prophetic parallelism.

Ewald|| arranged only the first two verses in lines, evidently thinking that the rhythm in the following verses was different.

* First edition, Göttingen, 1892; second edition, 1902.

† *Das Buch Jesaja* (Freiburg i. B. 1900), p. 55.

‡ *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (London, 1895), p. 23.

|| *Jesaja*² (Göttingen, 1867), p. 306.

In Hitzig's translation of the poetical books of the Old Testament, on the other hand, the whole poem is printed in lines.* In Kautzsch's *Textbibel* (1899) the second half of v. 5 and vv. 6. 7 are printed in lines, but not the preceding verses. Cersoy,† on the other hand, thinks that the first two verses were borrowed by Isaiah from a popular song, but that the following verses are not metrical. If we look at Sievers'‡ arrangement of the poem we can easily see how a commentator may arrive at the conclusion that vv. 3-7 are not metrical; for there is apparently no regularity whatsoever. But if the song is freed from superfluous scribal expansions the meter is the same from the first verse to the last.

There is no change of rhythm in the poem. This parable consists of four|| stanzas; each stanza is composed of four מְשִׁלִּים § with two beats in each hemistich. Each of the first three stanzas comprises two Masoretic verses, while the last stanza is represented by v. 7. The text of the first three stanzas is on the whole correct but considerably expanded; in the last stanza, on the other hand, we find an omission and a corruption. The scribal expansions are all such as we frequently meet with in other texts of the Old Testament.

I would arrange the Hebrew text as follows: **

* *Die poetischen Bücher des AT* (Leipzig, 1854); so, too, in Hendewerk's *Jesaja*, part 1 (Königsberg, 1838), p. 129, and in Umbreit's commentary (Hamburg, 1846).

† *L'apologue de la Vigne au chapitre Ve d'Isaïe* in the *Revue Biblique* (Jan. 1899), pp. 3-12 (cited in Marti's commentary, p. 55). Cf. ZA 9, 361.

‡ *Metrische Studien* (Leipzig, 1901), p. 431.

|| Ernst Meier in his commentary (Pforzheim, 1850) divided the poem into two stanzas: vv. 1-4 and 5-7.

§ See my paper on The Poetic Form of the First Psalm in *HEBRAICA*, 19, 137, n. 15. The four double-hemistichs of each stanza may be grouped in two couplets.

** The arrangement of Hebrew poetic texts in double-hemistichs, in two columns, which I introduced in part 15 (Proverbs) and 4 (Numbers, cc. 21. 23. 24) of *The Polychrome Bible*, is found in certain Hebrew MSS, e. g., in the Sephardic MS, British Museum, Oriental 2201. In this beautiful quarto MS, which is one of the oldest dated copies of the entire Hebrew Bible, having been written at Toledo in 1246 A. D., the three poetical books, Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, are written in double-hemistichs, in two columns. A collotyped facsimile reproduction of folio 283^a (containing Ps. 106. 23^b-107, 32) of this MS is given on plate ix of the Series of XV Facsimiles of MSS of the Hebrew Bible published by James Hyatt (London, 1897). Ginsburg says in his description of this plate, 'The three poetical books are arranged in prescribed lines,' whatever that may mean; see also Ginsburg's *Introduction to the Masoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (London, 1897), p. 675; cf. also *ibid.*, pp. 517. 729. Ginsburg's remarks are unfortunately not sufficiently clear (cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 591. 598. 606. 667). Cf. also the Cod. Or. Gaster. 151 described in *PSBA* 22, 234.

שירת הכרם לישעיהו

<p>שירת^א כרמו בקרון בן־שמן:</p>	<p>1 אשירה־נא לידידי כרם^ב לידידי</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>ויטעוהו שרץ וגם־יקב הצב־בו^ג:</p>	<p>2 ויעזקוהו ויסקלוהו ויבן מגדל^ד</p>	
<p>ואיש יהודה ובין כרמי:</p>	<p>3 יושב ירושלם שפט־נא ביני</p>	<p>II</p>
<p>ולא עשיתי־בו ויעש בא־שים:</p>	<p>4 מה־לעשות עוד^ה קניתי ל^וענבים</p>	
<p>את־אשר־אני עשה^ז והיה לבער^ח:</p>	<p>5 אודיעה־נא אתכם הסר משכחו</p>	<p>III</p>
<p>ולא יעדר^ט מהמטיר עליו^י:</p>	<p>6 ואשיתו בָתָה והעבים אצוה</p>	
<p>בית ישראל נטע שעשועיו</p>	<p>7 כ־כרם יהוה^{יא} ואיש יהודה</p>	<p>IV</p>
<p>והנה משקט והנה צעקה:</p>	<p>ויקו למשקט ויהקו לצדקה</p>	

2 (γ) בתוכו	(β) היה	1 (α) דודי
	ויעש בא־שים	2 (δ) ויקו (לעשות) ענבים
5 (ε) ועתה	(θ) עשות	3 (ε) ועתה
(κ) לכרמי	(η) מדוע	4 (ς) לכרמי
	(ξ) על	(λ) פלץ גדרו
(π) צבאות	(ο) מטר	6 (μ) לא יזמר
	(ϕ) ושיית	(ν) ועלה שמיר ושיית

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE TEXT.

- (1) **אֲנִי** (cf. Gesen.²⁷, § 105, b, n. 3) in **אֲשִׁירָהּ-נָא** is enclitic; the preceding **אֲשִׁירָהּ** should be accented on the ultima, not on the penult; so, too, **הַצִּבֵּי-בִּי** (v. 2), **עֲשִׂיתִי-בִּי** (v. 4), **אֹדִיעֶה-נָא** (v. 5).

אֲנִי לִידִידִי does not mean *to my friend* (AV, *to my well beloved*; RV, *for my well beloved*) or *in honorem Dei quem maxime diligo cantabo* (Grotius). Nor can the prefixed **ל** be taken as the **ל** *auctoris* (cf. Bachmann's explanation cited below), although in v. 3 the friend to whom the vineyard belongs is introduced as the speaker. The preposition **ל** means here *of* (so RV^M), that is, *concerning*, as in Ps. 3, 3: **רַבִּים אֲמָרִים לְנַפְשִׁי** *Many there are who say of me* and in Gen. 20, 13: **אֲמַרְיָא אֵלֵי הוּא** *Say of me, He is my brother*. This **ל** is not a popular shortening of **אֵל**, as Duhm supposes; in his commentary on Ps. 3, 3 Duhm says, **לְנַפְשִׁי** is a poetic equivalent of **עַל-נַפְשִׁי**. Nor can we read, with Bachmann,* **אֲלִי-יִדִידִי** (*haplography*). Cf. Gesen.²⁷, § 119, u.

אֲנִי may be a misplaced variant to **לִידִידִי** in the first hemistich. **אֲנִי** has **אֲנִי** for both **יִדִידִי** and **דֹּדִי**. **אֲנִי** is certainly not an abbreviation for **דֹּדִים** (Lowth, Cheyne, Budde,† Marti, as an alternative); this parable is no love-ditty (contrast Crit. Notes on Isaiah, SBOT, p. 117, l. 37, and Ginsburg's *Introduction*, pp. 793. 820). Cersoy points, **שִׁירַת דֹּדִי** *my love-song*, and Marti is inclined to adopt this emendation as the simplest solution of the difficulty. Bachmann proposes to read **שִׁירַת-דָּוִד = לְדָוִד**. According to Winckler, AoF (= *Altorientalische Forschungen*), 1, 341 (1896), the opening lines of the poem should be taken to mean: I will sing to my god a song of my god, concerning his vineyard. My god had a vineyard, &c. He believes that **דָּוִד** or **דֹּדִי** means *δαίμων* (Dido = *ἡ δαίμων*) and is inclined to substitute **לִידִידִי** or **לְדֹדִי** for **אֲנִי לִידִידִי** in the first and third hemistichs of the opening couplet.

After the insertion of **דֹּדִי** between **שִׁירַת-כְּרָמִי** it was necessary to prefix **ל** to **כְּרָמִי** (**Ἐ^v τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου = לְכְּרָמִי** is influenced by glosses ζ and κ).

Omit **אֲנִי הִיא** after **כְּרָם**; the vineyard still belongs to the friend; he tells the men of Judah in v. 5 what he purposes to do with it. The addition of **הִיא** was probably suggested by **כְּרָם הִיא לְנִבּוֹת** in 1 K 21, 1; cf. my notes on Cant. 8, 11 (*The Book of Canticles*, p. 60 = *HEBRAICA*, 19, 6).

There is hardly any paronomasia between **כְּרָם** and **קָרָן** as Duhm supposes; ק and כ are entirely different consonants. Nor is this case recorded in Dr. Casanowicz's dissertation on Paronomasia in the OT (Boston, 1894). There is just as much assonance between

* *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1894), p. 64.

† *New World*, March 1893, p. 49.

כרם and שִׁמֶן, viz. only one consonant and the vowels are identical.

Bachmann's emendation בקרב גַּי שִׁמֶן and Cheyne's שִׁמֶן instead of שִׁמֶן are not good. Nor need we read, with Kennedy, שִׁמֶן instead of שִׁמֶן; see, however, my remarks on בעל-המֶן, or rather בעל-המֶן, in Cant. 8,11 (*The Book of Canticles*, p. 33, n. 3). In his *Critica Biblica* (London, 1903), p. 10, Cheyne proposes to read בקרב בני יִשְׁמָעֵאל. The reference, Cheyne adds, is not to the Cimmerians but to the North Arabians. I prefer the received text. שִׁמֶן וְכֶרֶם; cf. Ἐν κέρατι, ἐν τόπῳ πίνον. שִׁמֶן is more poetic than the adjective שִׁמֶן, but it is not chosen on account of the meter; בקרב שִׁמֶן would have suited the meter just as well. Contrast my note on Cant. 1,6 in *The Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902), p. 31, n. 13 = *HEBRAICA*, 18, 221.

- (2) For שִׁרָק cf. Jer. 2,21; Gen. 49,11 and Abulwalid's explanation quoted in Gesenius' *Jesaja*, part 1 (Leipzig, 1821), p. 231 (repeated in his *Thesaurus*): هو اجود الكرم ويقال له السريق ويكون بالشام. Ἐ^T (i. e., *Fragmenta rescripta Tischendorffiana Isaiæ prophetæ*) has ἀμπελον σωρηκ, 3 *electam*, שִׁמֶן vines. A good German equivalent would be *rother Gutedel*. Winckler, *AoF* 1, 350, proposes to read גַּת instead of מְגִדָּל; but cf. Mark 12,1.

שִׁמֶן בחוכו is a superfluous scribal expansion.

The third מִשְׁלֵּ of v. 3, שִׁמֶן יִיעֵשׂ בְּאֲשִׁים, is a scribal expansion derived from the second מִשְׁלֵּ of v. 4. Both there and in the present gloss שִׁמֶן represents a subsequent addition; cf. יִיעֵשׂ לְמִשְׁפַּח (v. 7^e) and 59,9. 11. 3 inserts *ut faceret* not only in vv. 2. 4 but also in v. 7: *et expectavi ut faceret iudicium*. The expression יִיעֵשׂ לְעִשׂוֹת עֲנָבִים, without an indication of the different subject of עִשׂוֹת, is illogical; שִׁמֶן לְעִשׂוֹת עֲנָבִים is generally supposed to mean, *He (my friend) expected that it (the vineyard) would bear grapes* (שִׁמֶן וְלִחְפֵּי חֲתָן); but this would require at least the insertion of לוֹ, יִיעֵשׂ לוֹ לְעִשׂוֹת עֲנָבִים, לוֹ.

For שִׁמֶן בְּאֲשִׁים see my remarks in *HEBRAICA*, 19, 138, n. 20.

For בְּאֲשִׁים (3 *labruscae*, French *lambrusque*) cf. Gesenius' *Jesaja*, part 1, p. 233; part 2, p. 364, and ZDPV 1888, p. 160 (cited by Marti).

- (3) שִׁמֶן at the beginning of stanzas II and III (vv. 3. 5) is due to scribal expansion.

3 transposes שִׁמֶן יִיעֵשׂ and יִיעֵשׂ בְּאֲשִׁים; cf. my remarks on the Syriac version of Ps. 1 in *HEBRAICA*, 19, 137, n. 16 and below, n. 5 of the Explanatory Notes on p. 201.

- (4) **לכרמי** is a superfluous addition both here and at the end of the first **משל** of stanza III (v. 5).

מידוע is a scribal expansion. Logically it does not belong to the first hemistich, but to the second: Why, when I had a right to expect good grapes, did it bear worthless, small, sour berries? so correctly ARV and Hendewerk (see above, p. 194, n. *), p. 133; contrast Ernst Meier (see above p. 194, n. ||), p. 49.

For the insertion of **עשות** in **לעשות ענבים** instead of **לענבים** see the note on gloss δ (v. 2).

- (5) Omit **ועתה** as at the beginning of v. 3.

The rhythm of the second hemistich would perhaps be improved by transposing **אני עשה**; in this case we should have to read: **אני, אתה אשר עשה-אני**, **אני** being enclitic; cf. the notes on v. 1.

For **משוכתו** read **משפּתּו**. \mathfrak{S} has **מַשְׁכָּה** for **משוכתו** just as in v. 2 for **מגדל**.

פרץ גדרו והיה למרמס is a gloss (or variant) to the preceding **משל**; it may have been suggested by Hos. 2,8. Cf. my notes on Cant. 3, 8, 10; 4, 14 (see my *Book of Canticles*, p. 23, n. 14; p. 49, n. 49), also my note on Ps. 45,16 in *HEBRAICA*, 19, 136.

- (6) For **בַּתָּה** point **בַּתָּה**, from **בתח**, Arab. **بَتَّ** *to cut* (**قطع**), vii *to be cut off, decided, ended* (**انقطع**); Assyr. *buttutu* 'to end' (Delitzsch, HW 192^b). Arab. **قطع** means also *to exterminate, to annihilate*; cf. Heb. **נכרת** and **הכרית**, especially Gen. 41,36: **חפרת הארץ ברעב**. Bachmann proposes to read, following \mathfrak{E} **καὶ ἀνήσω τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου**, **בדד** (cf. 27,10).

לא יזמר is a scribal expansion of the following **יעדר**; so, too, **ועלה שמיר ושית**; cf. 7,23; 9,17; 10,17; 27,4. With the exception of 9,17 all those passages are post-Isaianic.

Bachmann proposes to read **ועלֵי** instead of **ועלה**, following \mathfrak{E}^T **καὶ ἀναβήσονται** (var. **ἀναβήσεται**), \mathfrak{J} *et ascendunt vepres et spinae*, \mathfrak{S} **סִבְחָן סִבְחָן סִבְחָן**; cf. Assyr. **elū** 'to grow up' (Delitzsch, HW 61^a, 4). Bachmann thinks that **שמיר ושית** does not stand in the accusative (Ges.²⁷, § 117, z) but is the subject of **עלה**. The clause **ועלה שמיר ושית** should therefore be translated, not: It shall shoot up in thorns and briars (so Cheyne in SBOT), but: There shall come up briars and thorns (so ARV). I believe, with Bachmann, that **שמיר ושית** is nominative, not accusative; but if the verbal predicate precedes the subject, the plural is not necessary; cf. Ges.²⁷, § 145, o. In Prov. 24,31 the meter requires not only the omission of the superfluous third hemistich **פסו פניו הרלים** (see SBOT *ad loc.*)

but also the excision of **פָּפוּ**, so that **עלה קמשנים** may be explained in the same way as **עלה שמיר ושית**, i. e. **עלה** may be verbal predicate to **קמשנים**. Prov. 24,30-34 must be read as follows:

30	על-שדה איש-עצל עברתי ועל-קדם אדם חסר-לב :
31	והנה עליה קמשנים ⁸ וגדר אבניו נחרסה :
32	ואחזתי אשית לבי ראיתי לקחתי מוקר :
33	מעט-שקות מקט תנומות מעט-חבוק ידים לשקב :
34	ובא כמחלקך רישך ומוחסרך כאיש מגן :

(7) 32 אנכי

(8) 31 קסר פניו חרלים

(9) 30 כל

Also in Is. 34, 13 we had better read :

ועל'ה בארמניה סירים קמוש וחוח במבצירה

א is due to ודיתה at the beginning of the following line. In Is. 32, 13 תעלה is Hif'il (= תצמיה); cf. my remarks in my paper on The Beginning of the Judaic Account of Creation in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 17, 158 (1896).

Omission of א על improves the rhythm.

א at the end of this verse is a superfluous scribal expansion.

(7) Syntactically כרם יהודה is predicate, and בית ישראל subject.

א צבאות is scribal expansion. It is canceled also by Sievers.

א משפה seems to be a corruption of משהט = משהת (in Is. 52, 14 it is better to read משהת instead of א משהת); cf. Heb.

(דרכו; Eth. ስሐጠ : sēhta, to err, to sin; ስሐጠ : sēhtat, error, sin; ስሐጠ : saḥāṭa, to hurt, to injure; Syr.

فساد corruption, destruction; Arab. سحت suḥt, corrupt practice, undue profit, unlawful gain (اكتسب السحت). The ט

instead of ת is due to the influence of the preceding ה, just as ס

is not unfrequently changed into צ under the influence of an

adjacent ה; cf. פסח = פסח = Assy. puššuxu, to appease, see

note 60 of my paper on Babylonian elements in the Levitic Ritual (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, 19, 73) and KAT³ 610, n. 3. In the

same way we might combine Heb. צמח to sprout with Assy. šamāxu (Delitzsch, HW 669^b). In Ges.-Buhl¹³, on the other hand,

Assyr. šamāxu is combined with Heb. שמח to rejoice and Arab.

(شمع بأفخ) or to be proud (علا وطال) to be high (شمع);

cf. Lat. *lucus laetissimus umbrae*, &c., and l. 8 of the fifth tablet of the Babylonian Nimrod* Epic (p. 24 of my edition): ṭābu ḡillašu || malī rīšāti; cf. Delitzsch, HW 607^b and Jensen's

inaccurate translation in Schrader's KB 6, 161 (*ihr guter Schatten*

* Cf. my remarks in the Critical Notes on Proverbs (SBOT), p. 33, l. 17. It might be well to state in this connection that I never believed that Nimrod was identical with the Kassite ruler Nazimaraddaš (see Cheyne-Black's *Encyclopædia Biblica*, 3418); I only suggested, nineteen years ago, that the name Nimrod might be a contraction of Nazimaraddaš; see my paper in the *Andover Review*, July, 1884, p. 94; cf. KAT³ 531.

ist voll 'Jauchzens;' this would be ḡillašu ṭabu rišāti malī; ṭabu is, of course, predicate to ḡillašu); *cf.* my remarks on Jensen's translations in my paper on The Beginning of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 22, p. 9; see also vol. 16, p. cx, and Critical Notes on Proverbs (SBOT), p. 60, l. 39.

We might also read מִשְׁחָד *bribery*, but מִשְׁחַט is preferable; in the first place the paronomasia between מִשְׁפַּח and מִשְׁחַט is more striking, and then the corruption of מִשְׁחַט to מִשְׁפַּח is more easily explained: the last two consonants of מִשְׁחַט were transposed, and ט was miswritten פ. Siegfried-Stade, *s. v.* מִשְׁפַּח, suppose that this word was coined by the prophet for the sake of the paronomasia with מִשְׁפָּט. Even if מִשְׁפַּח were

correct, it could not mean *bloodshed*, although Arab. سقا means *shedding blood, tyrant* (أران = سفح). For מִשְׁפַּח we should expect شفع.

Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 705^b, thinks that the ש in מִשְׁפַּח was substituted for ח. Ges.-Buhl¹³ compares مشقم

mušaffah, *thwarted, unsuccessful*; *cf.* Assy. sapāxu, *to annihilate, break up, destroy* (Delitzsch, HW 507^b). In note 80 of his dissertation on Paronomasia in the OT (1894) Dr. Casanowicz suggested that מִשְׁפַּח might be a transposition of מִשְׁחָה = Assy. saxāpu, *to overthrow*; but we expect a word for *injustice, corruption* (ἄνομία, 3 iniquitas). Cheyne's מִזְרָה is impossible.

Before מִצְדָּקָה in the last line of the poem the rhythm requires the insertion of a verb, either וַיִּקַּח, as in the preceding line, or וַיִּחַל, or וַיִּחַד, although this form does not occur in the OT.

It is not impossible that the original text read והנה למשחט and והנה לצעקה in the second hemistichs of the last two lines; *cf.*

Hagg. 1,9: והנה אל־הִרְבָּה והנה לִמְעַט; see note 3 of my lecture on the Book of Ecclesiastes in *Oriental Studies* (Boston, 1894), p. 264; *cf.* Ges.²⁷, § 143, e; § 114, i, note 1; Wright-de Goeje³, 2, 79.

This Isaianic poem may be translated as follows:

PARABLE OF THE VINEYARD.

- | | |
|---|--|
| I 1 I will sing of my friend, now,
My friend has ^β a vineyard | a song of ^α his vineyard: ¹
on a spur that is fertile. ² |
| 2 He hóed it and cléared it, ³
He búilt (there) ^γ a tówer ⁵ | and plánted choice v́ines ⁴ (there);
and héwed out ⁶ a wine-vat. ^δ |

(α) 1 my dear one of

(β) had

(γ) 2 in the midst of it

(δ) 2 he looked for it to bear (choice) clústers,—it bóre sour bérries!

II	3•Ye mén of Jerusalem, Be judges of my case ⁷	fréemen of Júdah! and thát of my vineyard!
	4 Could áught have been dóneś ⁿI lóoked for ^θ (choice) clusters,—	that Í did not dó there? it bóre sour bérries! ⁸
III	5•I will gíve you to knów Áwáy with its hédges!	what I púrpose to dó:κ thát cáttle may brówse there;λ
	6 A wáste be it hénceforth, ⁹ ξThe clóuds will I súmmon	μ no spáde ever délve it!ν to ráin on it néver.ο
IV	7 It is the vineyard of J'HVH, ^{10 π} The fréemen of Júdah,	the nátion of Ísrael, His chérished plantátion.
	He lóoked for corréctness, ¹¹ He hóped for cándor, ¹³	but ló! corrúptness! ¹² but ló! there is clámor! ¹⁴

(ε) 3 and now (ζ) 4 with my vineyard (η) why (θ) it to bear (ι) 5 and now (κ) with my
(λ) break dówn¹⁵ its wáll that dówn it be trámpled! [vineyard]
(μ) 6 it shall not be pruned and (ν) there shall shoot up thorns and briars
(ξ) on (ο) rain (π) 7 Sabaoth

EXPLANATORY NOTES.

(1) This is the first line of the song. Duhm, Cheyne, Marti, following Ewald, *Propheten*², 1, 306, consider the second line to be the beginning of the poem; they think that the first line is a special introduction, but this view is erroneous.

(2) Lit., on a horn, the son of fatness, *i. e.*, the terraced slope of a mountain exposed to the sun, with rich fertile soil; *cf.* the Swiss *Matterhorn*, *Schreckhorn*, *Faulhorn*, &c., Lat. *cornu montis*, Greek *κέρας τοῦ ὄρους*. AV^M, the horn of the son of oil; but RV^M, a horn, the son of oil. Cf. *apertos Bacchus amat colles* (Virgil, *Georg.* 2, 113) quoted by Delitzsch and Orelli.

(3) Of stones, AV: gathered out the stones thereof; *solum elapidavit*, Pliny 17, 30.

(4) See above, p. 197 (2).

(5) Cf. Mark 12, 1; Matt. 21, 33: A certain man planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged a place for the wine-vat, and built a tower. This is based on the Septuagintal rendering of our passage, *Ἐν^v καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα καὶ ἐχαράκωσα, ἔτε sepivit eam, et lapides elegit ex illa*, 5, transposing the two terms, *שָׂם סָבִיב וְעָרַב עָלֶיהָ* he tilled it and made a fence around it. AV translates therefore, *he fenced it*, or (in the margin) *he made a wall about it* instead of *he hoed it*. RV, *he made a trench about it* or (in the margin) *he digged it*. In the neighborhood of Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Hebron, &c., there are in almost all the vineyards small round tower-like houses of stone, in which

implements are stored and the keepers housed. The owners live in them during the vintage. Cf. Dillmann-Kittel⁶ (1898) *ad loc.*

(6) Wine-presses and vats, excavated in the solid rock, are common throughout Palestine; see the cut in the translation of Judges, in the *Polychrome Bible*, p. 68.

(7) Supply, *says my friend*. Cf. 2 S 12,5; Matt. 21,40.

(8) There is nothing humorous in the second line of v. 4, as Duhm supposes. The prophet's friend (*i. e.* JHVH) says, I confidently expected good grapes, but my vineyard bore nothing but worthless, small, sour berries. I had a right to expect good grapes after all the trouble I had taken.

(9) Cf. Is. 7,23-25.

(10) Isaiah does not say, My friend is JHVH, and his vineyard is Israel; he simply states, It is the vineyard of JHVH, *i. e.*, the Israelitish nation.

(11) Correctness of life and conduct, rectitude, justice.

(12) Corruptness, especially of the judges and other persons in power.

(13) Candor = fairness, impartiality, honesty, righteousness.

(14) Loud complaint of injustice and urgent demand for justice; cf. Exod. 22,22; Gen. 4,10. Dr. Horace Howard Furness, to whom I am indebted for some valuable suggestions, proposes to render the last couplet:

He looked for reason,— but behold! treason;
For men loving duty,— but lo! those loving booty!

This last line might be used for the translation of the last but one line of the Hebrew text. The last line of the poem might be rendered:

He looked for right,— but behold riot!

(so Dr. Marcus Jastrow). We might also use *justice* and *injustice*, *honesty* and *dishonesty*; but *correctness* and *corruptness*, *candor* and *clamor* seem to me preferable.

(15) The Hebrew text uses the infinitive: (I purpose) to break down; so, too, in the preceding double-hemistich, Away with its hedges = (I purpose) to do away with its hedge.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 126 363 1

